

## **COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY**

**June 17, 2002**

**5:30 PM**

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sysyn, Guinta, Osborne, Garrity, Forest

Messrs: T. Lolicata, Lt. Lussier, J. Taylor, J. Reese

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Clyde Daggett requesting the use of the Pine Street Parking Lot on Saturday, October 5, 2002 from 7:00 AM until 5:00 PM in conjunction with their annual "Give-Away-Day".

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Presentation of recodified and revised Traffic Ordinance.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated first of all we had sent out a copy of the draft of the ordinance and that is what was included with your package originally. That is actually what allows the authority for the Committee to make regulations subject to approval of the Board and I will walk you through that. I just also want to make reference to the other part of the ordinance, which is the package that you have in front of you that was distributed here. Every time there is a stop sign or a one-way street or a no parking zone we have to track that because if something happens in an accident for one thing and somebody sues somebody then obviously the judge is going to be looking for the effective date and whether or not the stop sign was installed according to regulation, etc. When the traffic ordinance was first established and I put a copy of that near Mary, there is a little green book and that is what we are actually replacing. That is the 1947 ordinance and in there originally your stop signs and things like that were dictated in the book but now the City has grown so now you have a table. What we have done by the ordinance is said okay by regulation and utilize these tables as the regulations. So this tells you where all of your stop signs are, where all your one-way streets are, your no

parking zones, limited parking, handicapped parking, etc. It is all laid out in here. Then there was this other handout that we gave you and that is the parking garages. We placed those in a table as well although it is not part of the same database. We have them in two separate databases. That outlines, for instance, some of the garages have meters in them so the meter sections will be designated in here or how many spaces you have and that type of thing. Every time the Committee takes an action and it goes to the Board and the committee report is approved, this is what you would be changing from now into the future. The rest of the ordinance runs the same as any other ordinance. After the Committee decides yes or no on this the process will be that it will go to the Board and we would ask that it be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading and follow the standard procedure for ordinance adoption. What is before you is what we have compiled and I have sat down with the Solicitor's Office and the Traffic Department. I have spoke with the Highway Department and obviously the Police Department. We have placed into this everything that is currently in the law that has been adopted by the Board and in addition to that we have added in the policies that have been established through the years. There are some things that the City has been doing by policy but it was never set forth in ordinance format so there is no clear delineation of who's duty is what. For instance, the Committee assigns the parking garages but there is no ordinance that states that is the Committee's assignment. So we are trying to establish it all in one place and put it in the same book as all of the other laws of the City are. If somebody wants to know what the traffic laws are in the City, they have one place to go. Right now it is contained basically in a box in my office along with that little green book. If the Police are trying to research something, they will call Carol and say what is on the books because that is the only way you are going to find it. That is what this ordinance attempts to do is just put everything in writing and into ordinance form that is the policy of current standings. We have made a couple of minor changes in it. We haven't delineated from any major policies that the City has established to this point and I can walk you through some of the changes that we did make in here if you would like or I can just answer questions that you may have.

Alderman Forest asked is this going to be done in a loose-leaf type folder so that when we change it you can change it.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered what will happen is it is actually written as Chapter 70. You know the blue book that we use for the Code of Ordinances? It will be part of that book so in the future if there is a change just like if you change any other ordinance in the City, it is going to be in the blue book and on the website.

Alderman Forest asked and I assume the Police Department has helped you with some of these.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered we made some changes in it for the Police Department based on some of the troubles that they have had over the course of time. They have reviewed it and Lt. Lussier, I believe, is here. If you would like, I am sure he could speak to the ordinance itself. I think pretty much any staff in the City that deals with the traffic ordinance will tell you that we are all dying for this thing to move forward and go through because it puts it all in one place so everybody can find it.

Alderman Forest stated for me it is 15 years too late.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied I started on it in 1989. Joan Walsh had worked on it prior to that. That is how long this thing has been trying to be put together. It is a major accomplishment to have it done before you.

Chairman Sysyn stated I want to thank you for all the work you did because this took a lot of work. It hasn't been brought up-to-date forever. Now we finally have something here.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated before you move on this I did speak to the Highway Department today and the snow removal in there is the way it is worded but there are a couple of changes to that that we would like to make just to clarify a few things. That section starts on Page 31. Basically what they are looking to do is in the emergency declaration section in the second paragraph they just want to remove the newspaper announcement because most of the time in a snow emergency you don't have time to put it in the newspaper anyway so we are sort of telling people we are going to do something that we know we can't. The next section, the temporary prohibition, the last sentence in that paragraph...sometimes they are required to do it for more than 24 hours so they would like that sentence removed from the ordinance. The other section is on the next page, 32, special prohibition, Item B, where it says "and parking meters shall be covered to the extent feasible." They don't cover the parking meters. They do put signage up all along the roadway when they are doing that snow removal. So, they are looking to have that deleted. The others are just basically...there are a couple of typographical corrections that I can make without making mention of. The only other issue that came up as part of this, too, is with impoundment. The Police Department currently has the contract and the \$85 is the fee that is charged and the current ordinance is \$90. We are changing it to \$85 because that is what people are really being charged. The Highway Department's suggestion on that was perhaps to add a cash only on that because that is what is demanded when they get down there is cash so at least if it is right in there it is up front and easier for somebody to state. Legally it would make no difference one way or the other. The only concern I would have is if you went into another contract that accepted

Visa cards down the road or something and you would have to amend the ordinance.

Alderman Garrity asked is that why we have to just take cash because it is in the contract with the person who is...

Deputy Clerk Johnson interjected I guess I would leave that to the Police Department to address.

Lt. Lussier stated we take cash because people could bounce checks or stop payment on credit cards. The people down there that take the money aren't really in a position to deal with credit cards. We will take a money order if somebody shows up with a money order. Cash has always been the policy.

Alderman Garrity asked so credit cards isn't doable.

Lt. Lussier answered no.

Alderman Garrity asked have we done credit cards in the past.

Lt. Lussier answered no. One of the wrecker companies took it upon itself to man the snow shed. It is an old Winnebago. They don't have the capacity to take credit cards. Then you get into stolen credit cards and everything else and we would have to hunt these people down. Cash is really the best way.

Alderman Garrity stated my thought is if someone's car gets towed in the middle of the night and they have to be at work for 7:30 AM...if they don't have \$85 worth of cash on them...

Lt. Lussier interjected if they have a credit card they probably have a mac card and they can go to the bank and get the cash out using that. People come up with the money. They always have.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the question is whether or not we really want to state that in the ordinance at this point. That was just a suggestion that Highway had made.

Lt. Lussier stated I think that is a good idea.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we could add verbiage in to do that if the Committee wants.

Chairman Sysyn asked to do what.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered just to add in some verbiage that would address that the cost shall be \$85 to be paid in cash.

Alderman Garrity asked, Lt. Lussier, do we have any history available on how often credit cards are bounced in this type of endeavor.

Lt. Lussier answered the history is zero because we don't take them. We have never accepted credit cards so I can't answer that.

Alderman Forest stated I think what Lt. Lussier is trying to say is credit cards are usually checked out right there and that takes a phone line and if they are in a Winnebago they wouldn't have a phone line so they would have no way of checking out whether the card is good or not. I see what his point is with the credit cards.

Alderman Garrity asked who is the contractor that does this for us. It is a collection of towing companies or someone that is separate and just accepts the money?

Lt. Lussier answered there are 10 or 12 towing companies and one of them has more or less voluntarily come forward and taken the responsibility for overseeing that project. They go out and hire a few people to man the Winnebago. They take care of all of the bookkeeping and the collection of the funds and then we meet with them afterwards and get the City's share.

Alderman Garrity asked the people doing it, do they get a stipend from the City.

Lt. Lussier answered no. The towing companies pay them.

Alderman Forest asked can we add cash or money order to the ordinance.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered yes. I think money orders are considered a cash tender technically anyway but we can address that. There are only a couple of other things that I want to point out as part of this process. One of the questions that had come up at the meeting that we had explored and said we would come forward with was in terms of the Segways. We did put a provision in their for assistive mobility device defined by RSA to exclude them as not being a roller coaster or a device that was not permitted to be utilized. I wanted to note that we had put that in, which is something new that wasn't in the ordinance before obviously. That was enabling legislation and we put it in because we felt since the Police are using them on occasion it was probably a good idea. The other thing is there were a few issues that came up in the process of this and one of the issues

that has come up is the fact that parking is enforced downtown as zones or districts and originally you did have some districts but you haven't had districts for a number of years. There was a request made at some point in time and I am not sure exactly where it surfaced because I really didn't research it where stickers were placed on to the parking meters stating you could only park within a one block radius. It was not addressed in the prior law and we have not addressed it in the current law. That is something that if the Committee wants to take it up at a later date certainly we would suggest you do that. I didn't want to muddy the waters by adding or taking out anything that wasn't already there or that wasn't logical to put in that has been a consistent policy issue that people have made decisions on that should really be part of the ordinance. So you really don't have that legal enforcement ability for that although people generally will move their cars based on those stickers so our suggestion is to leave it as is, see if you have problems and if the problems develop then you need to probably address that separately. The tables as you can see are pretty massive. We have over the course of time tried to keep things by the Committee to be adopted within certain parameters so that at least the tables are consistent. For instance, the through trucking is either not at all or during a specific hour of the day like from 9:30 PM until 7 AM or whatever is set. We try to do the same thing on limited parking times to the two hour zones so that you have some consistency within those tables so that we are not ending up with a pile like this by the time we are done but we can keep it to some manageable portion. As time goes on, we might come back to the Committee and say we would really appreciate it if you could be more consistent and keeps things in sequences of sorts so that we can keep it in a manageable fashion because every time you change this in reality we also have to keep copies in the Clerk's Office for people to be able to come and look at and we are trying to keep the history of it becomes sometimes an accident might have occurred two years ago and they are researching it today so you have to have that information available as well. That would be my only other comments on it. I guess with the changes that we had suggested this evening is the way we would want it to come out of the Committee with a recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to approve the Traffic Ordinance and recommend that it be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

Chairman Sysyn advised that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:

**STOP SIGN BACKUP (Emergency Act):**

On Belmont Street at Webster Street (NEC)

Alderman Wihby

**STOP SIGN:**

On Pearl Street at Elm Street (NEC)  
Alderman Guinta

**NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:**

On Pearl Street, north side, from a point 30 feet east of Elm Street to a point 25 feet easterly.  
Alderman Guinta

On Hall Street, west side, from a point 40 feet south of Spruce Street to a point 25 feet south  
Alderman Osborne

**PARKING 1 HOUR SEVEN DAYS:**

On Beech Street, west side, from a point 60 feet north of Cedar Street to Cedar Northback Street.  
Alderman Osborne

**NO PARKING:**

On Lake Avenue, north and south side, from Maple Street to a point 150 feet easterly.  
Alderman Osborne

**RESCIND NO PARKING:**

On Lake Avenue, north and south side, from Maple Street to a point 100 feet easterly.  
Alderman Osborne

On Hall Street, west side, from Spruce Street to a point 105 feet south  
Alderman Osborne

On Hall Street, east side, from Spruce Street to a point 105 feet south  
Alderman Osborne

**PARKING 2 HOURS (8AM-6PM):**

On Page Street, west side, from a point 90 feet north of Candia Road to a point 100 feet northerly.  
Alderman Pinard

**NO PARKING 7AM-7PM MON-FRI:**

On Hall Street, east side, from Spruce Street to a point 105 feet south  
Alderman Osborne

Alderman Garrity stated four or five weeks ago, Tom, we talked about South Elm Street where it abuts Wyoming. I don't see anything for no parking signs on the agenda.

Mr. Lolicata replied these are the ones that I wrote up for this meeting. I am going to have a bunch for you in July.

Chairman Sysyn asked when will our next regular meeting be, Carol.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered in July.

Alderman Osborne stated I have a question on parking one hour seven days on Beech Street. Who put in for that? I keep seeing that on the agenda.

Mr. Lolicata replied that is next to the church.

Alderman Osborne responded I know where it is. I just want to know who put in for it.

Mr. Lolicata stated that has been there before. What they did was change the ordinance to put a handicapped space in the middle and still maintain the one hour seven days a week.

Alderman Osborne asked but they had something different in the last agenda didn't they.

Mr. Lolicata answered right.

Alderman Osborne asked so they can't make up their mind what they want to do with it is that it.

Mr. Lolicata answered it all came about due to the middle part where the handicapped is. First it was for the ambulance and then it became a space for handicapped. The one hours on each side we have to do over again but it is still one hour for seven days.

Alderman Osborne stated it is only a half a block long that we are talking about. Who put it for it?

Mr. Lolicata replied I think Alderman Clancy but I am just guessing.



Alderman Guinta asked, Tom, are our friends on Pearl Street happy with this loading zone.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes they are and I am going to keep it that way so nobody else can park there except for loading.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta, it was voted to approve the traffic agenda.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item of the agenda:

Communication from Jay Taylor on behalf of Charles Denault, representing Cameron Real Estate owner of property located at 889 Elm Street, requesting extension of their existing agreement with the City for leasing seventy (70) parking spaces in the Victory Parking Garage for an additional 20-year term.

Mr. Taylor stated Mr. Denault who is here tonight, incidentally and came up from Nashua to attend the meeting. If you would like to hear from him I will leave that up to the Committee but basically his current lease runs out in January of 2005 and you might ask well why is he coming before us at this point to try to get it extended. The answer is when you are negotiating leases on an office building you need to know out several years whether or not you have parking so even though the lease is not expiring for two and a half years I think it is appropriate for him to start thinking about this now. Given our current situation with respect to the sale of the parking garages, which obviously took place subsequent to my original submission of this letter, the suggestion I have that might be in order is if the Committee agrees we might think about doing something along the lines of giving Tom the authority to negotiate with Mr. Denault subsequent to a decision being made as to whether or not the parking garages are going to be sold. Clearly if we are going to sell the garages there is no reason for the City to be discussing a lease at all. On the other hand if the City is, in fact, going to keep the garage the approval to give Tom the authorization to negotiate an extension of the lease would certainly fit in those circumstances.

Chairman Sysyn asked how much is he paying for space now.

Mr. Lolicata answered I believe it is up to \$52.50.

Mr. Taylor stated he understands that if we go forward with a new lease that he will be subject to whatever the City is going to charge.

Alderman Forest stated I know the City is contemplating selling all three garages and if Mr. Denault is willing to agree that if we sell the garages then whatever lease he has has to be negotiated with the new owners...is that what this would be like.

Mr. Taylor replied that certainly would be a possibility. I guess what I was suggesting is that the Committee might recommend that Tom be given the ability to renegotiate this lease assuming that the City keeps the garage. If the City sells the garage then all bets are off and he is on his own because we would have no further control over it.

Alderman Guinta asked what is your suggestion. I don't know what the timeline is going to be yet for the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to make a decision with respect to retaining the garages or selling the garages. What you are asking is for us to give Tom the authority. I assume those negotiations wouldn't begin until the BMA has at least made a decision?

Mr. Taylor answered that would be my suggestion.

Alderman Guinta stated the second question I have is the termination portion of the agreement, I guess I would expect that that would be somewhat...there would be a little more detail. For argument sake if we decided not to sell the garages this year but five years down the road they are sold, this agreement doesn't really identify unless I am reading it incorrectly what happens in that scenario. I guess the only other thought I would have is maybe to relook at some of the wording of the intent of the agreement just to make sure that we know what happens if and when during the agreement the sale of the garages does occur.

Mr. Taylor replied I think when this original agreement was written there was no contemplation of selling the garages so that was not an issue. In the new negotiation that could be an issue and it could be addressed in the contract. If that is what your desire is we certainly can do that.

Alderman Guinta responded I just think it makes sense logically to include that. The other question I have is, Tom, if you were to negotiate this are we giving you authority to negotiate it and sign it or do you have to come back to this Committee for further approval?

Mr. Lolicata replied I have signed some before so if you can decide whatever you want.

Chairman Sysyn asked do you want to have him come back to us.

Alderman Guinta answered I think I would just like a report on how the negotiations are going if that is okay with everybody.

Alderman Osborne asked wouldn't the lease follow the new buyer anyway. That would be put in the contract if you are thinking about selling it anyway, right? Usually a lease will follow if a new buyer takes on anything – property or whatever.

Mr. Taylor stated it could be written that way or it could be written as Alderman Guinta suggested with an out clause in the event that the City sells the garages. It could be written in such a manner that any lease that the City had would terminate at that point. It could be written either way.

Alderman Osborne stated it is good for one side and then the other one is good for the other side so it is a matter of Catch 22 but either one could be written in there right.

Mr. Taylor replied yes.

Chairman Sysyn stated we could have Mr. Lolicata negotiate with Mr. Denault and then come back to us with the final terms.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta, it was voted to authorize Tom Lolicata to negotiate with Mr. Denault assuming the City will be keeping the garages and report back to the Committee on the final terms.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Lolicata stated we don't have an agreement anymore with the Rubenstein Lot and Singer Park Foundation. With the concerts coming up this summer I am looking for some direction from you people with regards to parking at Rubenstein for these concerts. Right now we are protected by ordinance for events at the Verizon. You are going to have a summer series coming up down there and there is revenue for the City to be had. I am talking some big concerts whereby they can utilize the Rubenstein Lot. The price is already set by ordinance. I am just looking for some direction from you to either go ahead and have somebody there collecting money during the summer depending on what is going on down there. Now we have somebody at Rubenstein when we have a big concert at Verizon. It is going to be utilized for the big concerts at Singer, whatever they may be. There are also some other small things going on like for a non-profit where we won't charge for parking but for a big concert yes we would for the City. I am looking for direction from the Committee to allow me to go out and collect some revenues from these concerts. I believe the first one is coming on July 13.

Chairman Sysyn stated also Hippo Press is planning to do something down there on Tuesday evenings.

Mr. Lolicata replied they just informed me about what they have going on down there. That is another example. There could be other small things going on like that where it is for families and small crowds where you wouldn't charge them but for a large concert right next door where they are expecting thousands of people I would expect the City to get down there and collect some money.

Alderman Forest stated you started off by saying that we now longer have an agreement for the Rubenstein Lot. Did we have a contract with them?

Mr. Lolicata replied we originally had a small contract with them, which elapsed two or three months ago. There is no written agreement with the Foundation anymore.

Alderman Forest asked do we have to renegotiate a contract.

Mr. Lolicata answered no we don't. That is your parking lot. You don't have to renegotiate anything. It is up to you people. I am just throwing something forward. We have our own City parking lot. It has nothing to do with Singer. It could be utilized by the City for the City.

Alderman Forest asked can we make a decision to let Hippo Press use that parking lot. It is ours you are saying?

Mr. Lolicata answered if they go through the Traffic Committee and ask for permission to go down there as a Committee you can probably say yes and we probably wouldn't charge them because it is for kids but if Cher was going to go down there instead of Verizon and you are expecting 20,000 people then I would like to have the authority to go down there and collect some money for you.

Alderman Guinta asked, Tom, did you say the price was already set by ordinance.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes it is \$5/car. We have ordinances for the parking lots and that one was already done for \$5.

Alderman Guinta asked so if there is an event at Singer and we are collecting at the Rubenstein Lot we can only collect \$5.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes because this has all been preset by ordinance.

Alderman Guinta asked and what are we doing right now with that lot when there is an event at Verizon.

Mr. Lolicata answered we are charging the same. It is \$5. The only lot that is \$10 is the Pine Street Lot.

Alderman Guinta stated I guess my question...I certainly don't mind trying to find some revenues for the City for larger venues but my question would be how do we determine what is a large venue and what is a small venue and what is a venue that...I mean the Hippo Press venue I have no idea how many people they would expect but we would certainly like to make sure that we don't do anything to deter that event from happening or similar events to that. I don't know what direction we could give Tom that makes sure that events like the event that Hippo Press is proposing will still...

Chairman Sysyn interjected I think Jody Reese was planning to use it on Tuesday nights and get a reduced rate for parking. Is that what you were looking at?

Mr. Reese stated whatever you see fit. The \$5 would be a bit much but as you can see we are just trying to put on a...we are not sure it is going to happen yet but if we do put this on we would like to put on an outdoor film series and we would like to use that lot in addition to the one that Singer has in the front area. The two natural lots to use for that for feeders.

Alderman Guinta asked were you thinking about charging for parking.

Mr. Reese answered we were thinking about charging \$2.

Alderman Guinta asked and that would defray the cost of the event.

Mr. Reese answered that is right.

Alderman Guinta stated I would like to see events like the event that Hippo is proposing at that location and I want to make sure that whatever we do do we make sure that we are not going to stop Hippo or other...not necessarily just Hippo but any others who want to do venues of a similar nature. How can we direct Tom? Would there be a number that you would be comfortable with that we would expect in terms of parking where we start charging?

Mr. Lolicata replied I am very comfortable with the number now that we have. It is just the idea of people like Jody or some non-profit coming in here...there is going to be an ice cream carnival coming up, whereby the City as a good neighbor wouldn't charge people. I understand where you are coming from and that is why

I am bringing this up. I would hate to charge somebody \$5 who is charging \$2 for a picture show but it wouldn't bother me to charge \$5 for somebody going down there for a concert. There is a difference. I don't know how else I can say this but it is either that or straight across the board and I think Carol might agree on that because it is an ordinance unless there is some way we can do this differently.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated if I understand this, the Committee wants to be able to provide exclusions or exemptions from the \$5 fees per car when certain events are held and certainly that is within the authority of the Committee to recommend to the Board. When are you intending to start this?

Mr. Reese replied from July 23 until August 27 every Tuesday night.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated if the Committee desired what it could do is place a change to the Board to allow for exemptions and recommend this to be one exemption. Other exemptions could be done the same as any other regulation. Basically the Committee would approve it and then the Board would approve it or we could put it right in the Committee's jurisdiction. We could ask the Board to put it in the Committee's jurisdiction totally and then if somebody came before you at the last minute rather than us polling the whole Board we would just be dealing with the Traffic Committee. That is a policy decision that you need to make.

Alderman Forest asked, Jody, are you looking to start this on July 23.

Mr. Reese answered yes.

Alderman Forest asked can we get this to the full Board in time to get it passed.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered the Board is meeting on July 2. Any actions tonight will be before the Board on July 2. My suggestion is first that the Committee vote to recommend to the Board that the Committee be authorized to make exemptions to the fees charged for civic center events at the Rubenstein Lot when other events are being held at Singer Park or in that area and that would cover the first part of it for authority purposes and then the second would be that the Committee take a separate motion to vote on the request of Hippo Press to have the space for \$1 and let them take on the liabilities. Basically that is the way I would do it. I would set it up as a lease of that parking lot for that night for \$1 to whoever and let them take on the liabilities of insurance, etc. or collections and all of that. You are now out of it. You are not managing it or doing anything. You have just leased that space out for the evening or the day as the case may be. I am sure that the Solicitor's Office could work out some kind of an agreement. That, I think, would be your best bet.

Alderman Forest moved to recommend that the Committee be authorized to make exemptions to the fees charged for civic center events at the Rubenstein Lot when other events are being held at Singer Park.

Alderman O'Neil asked isn't there some correlation between what Singer does for parking and the lot that they are responsible for and Rubenstein. We can't charge \$5 at Rubenstein if they are only charging \$2 and I think in the agreement we had with them on Singer Park events they manned the Rubenstein Lot and there was some split.

Mr. Lolicata answered that agreement is over with.

Alderman O'Neil stated I understand that but what was the agreement.

Mr. Lolicata responded at the time they were charging more.

Alderman O'Neil asked more than what.

Mr. Lolicata answered they were charging \$7 to \$10 a car down there.

Alderman O'Neil stated you have two lots sitting there and they have to be somewhat treated the same. We own one and they have one through the lease they have with the City. Do you follow me? Somehow we have to craft this where it works together. There are events they do down there where they don't charge for any parking. Other events they may get \$2 and during concerts that is where they get the highest dollar. There has to be a way to work it with Singer Park. Almost take the contract we had and renew it.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated what he is talking about is another issue entirely. I would agree that if you are going to have that you should have some kind of an agreement down there as to what you are going to do because that parking lot services Singer Park a lot more than it does the civic center.

Alderman O'Neil stated the numbers I have seen in reports from Jay Taylor who I think got from Tommy, it is hardly serving the civic center. The numbers are very, very low. Tom, are we still manning it with people?

Mr. Lolicata replied when we have large concerts, yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked but that is about it now right. Not for hockey games?

Mr. Lolicata answered that is correct. When Singer has an event it is going to be very, very highly used.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think it is directly related to Singer and I think we need to work out an agreement with the park. Jody, do you know what they were going to charge for parking in the parking lot that they control?

Mr. Reese replied I think we are going to charge \$2.

Alderman O'Neil stated it should be \$2 in that parking lot and \$2 in Rubenstein. Do you agree not so much with the dollar amount but that the two lots have to work together? Jody that is a question for you because you are trying to put on an event.

Mr. Reese answered absolutely.

Alderman O'Neil stated if you were able to get \$5 for parking in the Singer parking lot then you should get \$5 for parking in the Rubenstein Lot.

Mr. Reese replied yes they should work in concert with each other.

Alderman O'Neil stated so somehow we have to work that out and I think an agreement with the Park Foundation may be the way to do it. If the Park Foundation doesn't charge, then we shouldn't be charging.

Alderman Lopez stated the concept to have this free to a degree with a charge of \$4 for adults and \$2 for children and I don't see anything in here for parking.

Mr. Reese replied we had hoped to charge \$2 for parking.

Alderman Lopez asked is that you or Singer Park.

Mr. Reese answered I think it will be us. This is still tentative. We haven't signed anything with Singer Park yet. We are negotiating with them now.

Alderman Lopez asked do you have to charge \$2. Couldn't you use the Rubenstein Lot for free?

Mr. Reese answered we could but the parking revenues would defray the cost of renting the movie.

Alderman Lopez stated get a sponsor. That would be the simplest way, really.

Mr. Reese replied I understand. Not to get into it all but when you rent films like this you actually have to give a good chunk of the money from the door to the film



company so you actually don't get any of the revenue or very little of it from the film so you actually have to use auxiliary ways to raise money to pay for the film and all of the other things like parking and food which is of course why it is so expensive to get popcorn at Hoyt's.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with Alderman O'Neil and with Tom Lolicata. If somebody is going to make a profit then the City should get something.

Mr. Reese replied I completely agree. I don't know what it was with Singer but we would be happy to split the revenues. To be honest I don't know if we are going to get 200 people or 2,000 people. It may not even be necessary to use the second lot, the Rubenstein Lot. It may only be necessary to use that lot with Singer. We just wanted to keep the option open for Tuesdays with a rain date on Wednesdays. If this does come off and we do this and there are enough cars to spill over they wouldn't have to park on the street on the way up. They could just park in that lot there for \$2 and then walk down and go in. That was our hope.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated if you want to take into account what Alderman O'Neil was saying then you would do it a little differently. That would be that you could deal with the Hippo situation because you need to deal with that obviously and then I think my suggestion would be that the Traffic Director and perhaps Jay or somebody else be assigned to go back and talk to the Park Foundation to determine an agreement for that park exclusive of major events being held at the civic center. Alderman Forest asked would I have to add an amendment to the first motion.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied I think you want to pull that first one off because depending on what agreement they come back with you may or may not want to do that later on but for right now I think you want to deal with Hippo because that is going to be coming up so you could take a motion to recommend that they be allowed to utilize that subject to the approval of the City Solicitor and let the Solicitor deal with whatever legalities need to be worked out. We can contact the Solicitor's Office tomorrow so they can review that situation before the Board meeting. In terms of the rest of it, I would suggest that you do nothing until you have somebody sit down with Singer if you want to proceed with what Alderman O'Neil was saying.

Alderman Forest stated I will withdraw my motion but before I do will this all be done prior to the next meeting.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied the Hippo Press request can be dealt with by the July 2 Board meeting, which will be adequate for their needs. For the other one my suggestion is that the Traffic Director and perhaps Jay Taylor because he has

been involved with a lot of different parking situations, be asked to go back to Singer and see what they can arrange for an agreement and bring that back to the Committee for consideration. Now the Committee can always hold a special meeting so that we can get it addressed as soon as they get that done. We don't need to wait for the next regular meeting either for that. In the event that they can pull something together before July 2 certainly we will get it to you.

Alderman Forest moved to allow Hippo Press to hold an Outdoor Family Film Series at Singer Park and to utilize the Rubenstein Parking Lot on Tuesday evenings from July 23 through August 27 subject to meeting the requirements of the Highway, Risk, Traffic, Police, Fire, Building and City Clerk Departments. Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Guinta moved to have Tom Lolicata, Jay Taylor, Bill Jabjiniak and Tom Clark to work with the Singer Park Foundation to determine a new agreement for parking to be brought back to the Committee. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Communication from Bethany Plumpton requesting a permit for a block party to be held on June 29, 2002 at 267 Walnut Street.

Alderman Guinta stated it is in my ward.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated she came in to our office today requesting a block party.

Alderman Guinta stated it says no alcohol in the street and no live bands on the bottom of the second page. Police and Fire approved it.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated Highway has not signed off because she did not get there today. She started this process this afternoon. She has really been running around today.

Alderman Guinta moved to approve the request subject to the approval of the Highway Department. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Osborne asked, Lt. Lussier, how many times has something like this been approved in the past.

Chairman Sysyn answered all the time. I had a couple in my ward that I had some complaints on.

Alderman Osborne asked is this opening up a can of worms as far as who is throwing it and so on. If I wanted my birthday party on Cedar Street could I close off half of my block?

Lt. Lussier answered it depends on which block of Cedar Street. We do take things into account.

Alderman Osborne stated I am just saying if we start this...I don't know how often it has been done in the past outside of non-profit organizations and things of that sort. There is no problem there but just an average person blocking off streets because they want to have a party is what I am trying to say.

Lt. Lussier stated when people want to have a block party they would come into the Police Department and we sit down with them and determine the approximate number of people they are planning on having attend, go over some ground rules...we tell them that they are not allowed to utilize the street and set up grills or put any other obstruction in the street. It is just to slow down the traffic going up or down the street.

Alderman Osborne asked so there is no dancing or anything like that in the street.

Lt. Lussier answered no.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn asked do we have an extension with the management company that we currently have for the garages.

Mr. Lolicata answered verbally we have agreed and I believe we were talking three months. We verbally agreed to that.

Alderman Guinta asked didn't we request a copy of...

Mr. Lolicata interjected I am trying to gather all of them for you. I have eight of them and I will get them out to you.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

7. Discussion regarding free parking at the Canal and Victory Parking Garages on Saturday and Sunday.

This item remained on the table.

8. Discussion regarding recommendation for management of the Canal and Victory Parking Garages.

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Guinta, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee